

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: May 14, 2001
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of
May 2, 2001 (Meeting #17)

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Jack Burkman	City of Vancouver Council Member
Jeanne Harris	City of Vancouver Council Member
Michael Hefflin	City of Ridgefield
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Council Member (P)
Mary Kufeldt-Antle	City of Camas Council Member (A)
Betty Sue Morris	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Jim Robertson	Town of Yacolt Mayor (P)
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners
	(P) Primary (A) Alternate

Public:

Marnie Allen	Clark County Schools
Foster Church	The Oregonian
Margaret Ellis	The Columbian
Ken Hadley	Self
Jessica Hoffman	Clark County Association of Realtors
Elizabeth Holmes	Landerholm Law Firm
Michael Holmes	Observing
Steve Horenstein	Miller Nash
Matt Lewis	CCHBA
Dean Lookingbill	RTC
Alison Mielke	Friends of Clark County
Scott Patterson	Clark County Association of Realtors
Randy Printz	Landerholm Law Firm
Steve Raimo	Self/Glad Tidings Church

George Vartanian

Self

Staff:

Monty Anderson	City of Washougal Planning Director
Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Rich Carson	Clark County Director of Community Development
Derek Chisholm	Clark County Long Range Planning
Eric Eisemann	Cities of La Center & Ridgefield
Lianne Forney	Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director
Bob Higbie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Eric Holmes	City of Battle Ground Planning Director
Mary Keltz	Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager
Rich Lowry	Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Oliver Orjiako	Clark County Long Range Planning
Marty Snell	City of Camas Planning Manager
Bryan Snodgrass	City of Vancouver Planner
Josh Warner	Clark County Community Development
Phil Wuest	Clark County Long Range Planning

1. Roll call / Introductions

Morris calls the meeting to order at 4:10. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations.

2. Review February 7, 2001 Steering Committee Notes

The committee reviewed the notes that were handed out at the meeting. No changes to the minutes noted.

3. Update on Board of Commissioners decisions on the plan update

Lee gave the update. A summary memo (Comprehensive Plan Update Board Direction on Major Issues) was handed out and reviewed. Morris stated that this is a time to discuss the issues. A letter was submitted by the City of Camas to reconsider density issues. The board has agreed to reconsider the density issue. The tentative date for reconsideration is May 16, 2001 at 2:00. It will be advertised to the public, but will not be a formal hearing, as testimony will not be taken

4. Open Discussion

Idsinga appreciates the reconsideration. Battle Ground has about a 88/12 split now. He thinks 60/40 is wrong and the goal should be market driven. He is also disappointed in the 1.5 percent recommendation for population growth. He felt the 2.1 percent was low, but realistic. He does not like to use the Portland numbers. He questions how the future will be shaped and that people will still come even if we do not plan for it. We

need to plan for what is coming. Limiting growth within the UGB will raise the price of lots inside the UGB and will fill the rural lots more quickly. He says that future expansion will then be more difficult.

Morris welcomes comments. But 1.5 percent will not be reconsidered.

Hefflin talks about the 60/40 split. He feels there was a loose consensus about using a different system than 60/40. Morris responds that the vote of the Commissioners was 1-1-1. Therefore, it was a fall back position. Pridemore says it was a status quo decision. Hefflin says that his city can provide any info that is necessary to the commissioners please let them know. Morris would like info on the zoning maps in the cities. Also to know more about the respective codes. La Center has only one residential zone with minimum lot sizes. This would be helpful to see the implementation measures.

Kufeldt-Antle asks if the committee and the commissioners agreed on a definition of multi-family. Camas is having a problem knowing what to implement. Stanton asks if row houses are being counted. Harris says there is a definition, but Morris says there is not an agreed to definition.

Kufeldt-Antle thanks the Commissioners for reopening the density decision. She comments on the numbers issue. SEPA is expensive and assumes that county will take the lead on this with support from the cities. If the SEPA (EIS) work is done now to accommodate all of the population estimates so that we do not have to go back and do the work if we change the numbers in the future. The cost could be prohibitive. Pridemore says that we will analyze different alternatives. Lowry says that if the board had gone for a high percent we would have had to include a low number, but not necessarily the reverse. Burkman encourages the EIS to have a narrow scope. Morris says that the work will be limited because capital facilities will be limited. Burkman says the time and money will be less with a narrower scope. Burkman says that with a market factor included there will be an increase in UGBs. Lee says that the market factor is a supply side not a population side issue. The implications of the growth need to first be determined. Then look at the 20-year horizon. The employment forecast will also be reviewed again. Morris states that we do not know if the UGBs will be moved. Staff has direction and will move forward with that information. Snodgrass says that they estimated that at 2.5 percent they would need an additional 24 square miles incorporated into the Vancouver UGB. At 1.5 it is 14 square miles with market factors. Morris says that we need to talk because county staff is saying different things. Lee says that density is a necessity to run the model. Also the new employment numbers will be out. Morris asks about having new calculations ready by June 6. Lee says the date would work for a response as to movement of UGBs. Burkman asks if there will be new info for the reconsideration of density. Morris responds that they want to get to a 2-1 vote. There is a possibility of change with new info, particularly zoning. The density numbers are coming. Lee says that we may have the numbers by June 6th. Morris states that the commissioners are the ones who need to make the decision.

Burkman says that the City of Vancouver sees the current policy as appropriate and they want stronger implementation.

Hefflin reflects that enforcement was going to be a sticking point. This moved us to look at different ways to approach the issue and move toward density. Burkman agrees, but the bar must be set and reached.

Kufeldt-Antle goes back to the cost of the EIS and what are the alternatives. She would like to see us "over-plan". She wants as much work done now as possible. Burkman asks if the info can really be reused. Lowry responds that it depends on the situation at the time. Morris asks about the finances from the cities. Kufeldt-Antle says that she assumes the cities will contribute. Stanton states that the growth may be front-loaded. Stanton about having urban reserves designated. Lowry says that the current urban reserves were not analyzed in 1994. These issues need to be scoped by staff and looked at through a cost/benefit analysis. The question is what is the extra analysis going to cost. Kufeldt-Antle is worried about how quickly things may change. Morris says that county staff will be given the issue as to the looking into the breadth of the EIS.

Morris asks if there are other issues. No one brings up other issues.

5. Technical Advisory Committee Update

Lee says that the EIS subject was brought up in the meeting. He says that info will be back to the Board after the next meeting on May 11. The info should come back to the Steering Committee. Pridemore would like an e-mail on this issue.

6. Other

Kufeldt-Antle presents info from the Health District (HD). A letter was passed out. A citizen was concerned about septic issues. The HD board decided that it was a valid concern. Meetings have been taking place with Hazel Dell Sewer District. The HD wants to present to the Committee. They want some consensus on how to educate the public on the potential hazards. They want to be on the June 6 agenda. One objective is to create a program with funding to move forward on the issue. Morris says that the HD and other jurisdictions want to start removing septic from within the UGB because of all the concerns about them. What policies can be adopted to move this forward. The jurisdictions should try to be more uniform. Clark County only does treatment, not the pipes in the ground. Burkman asks if there is info on the financial implications. Kufeldt-Antle responds that there are some grants available and more info will be available. Harris says that there are systems available. Burkman sees this as a long-term vision. Kufeldt-Antle agrees. Idsinga asks about timelines. Kufeldt-Antle says there are currently no timelines in place. Lowry says we fall back on state law. The issue may be to add a local requirement to improve the implementation with funding available. There is plenty of legal authority in state law to allow for more stringency than is in state law. Morris says this will be on the agenda for June 6.

7. Next meeting time and date

Meeting is set for June 6, no meeting for the middle of May. The next meeting may go past 6:00. Lee comments that the next meeting might be too soon for firm numbers on the UGB expansion issue. Wuest says an additional month may be necessary. Need TAC meetings, GIS processing and new employment numbers. Also need to get to final allocation and have the remainder numbers. Pridemore asks if there can be rough numbers. Wuest responds that it can be narrowed, but it would be better to wait to get firmer numbers. Morris says that the numbers have changed and more time may be necessary. What is the range that we will be looking at and what numbers are needed. Wuest says we can provide gross numbers. Carson asks if we are looking county-wide. Kufeldt-Antle asks what number is being used for population. Wuest says 480,000 for 2023 at 1.5 percent growth. The difference from today is 140,000. 81 percent of new is 114,000. We now have capacity for 90,000. Need to accommodate 24,000 + 25 percent to land supply.

8. Adjourn

The Steering Committee adjourned at 5:25PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - may 2 2001(#17).doc